

THE DATA BEHIND EXTREME RISK LAWS

An Evidence-Based Policy That Saves Lives

Gun violence is a leading cause of death in the United States. Risk-based policies that help to create time and space between an at-risk individual and a firearm have great life-saving potential nationwide. A growing body of research suggests that extreme risk laws are valuable gun violence prevention tools.

REDUCING ACCESS TO PEOPLE AT RISK OF VIOLENCE SAVES LIVES

- Gun violence is a public health crisis in the United States. Firearms are the method used in half of all U.S. suicides and three-quarters of all U.S. homicides, taking nearly 40,000 lives each year - over 100 every single day.ⁱ The toll of gun violence on American families and communities is significant.
- Easy access to guns significantly increases risk of both firearm suicide and homicide.^{ii,iii}
- Policies are needed that reduce easy access to firearms by people who are at elevated risk of violence.

EXTREME RISK LAWS ARE EVIDENCE-BASED

Most extreme risk laws are known as *extreme risk protection orders (ERPOs)*. The policy was developed by the Consortium for Risk-Based Firearm Policy (Consortium) in 2013 based on the leading research on risk factors for violence. The Consortium called for states to pass a policy that empowers law enforcement and family members to work with courts to temporarily remove firearms from those who pose a danger to themselves or others.^{iv}

RESEARCH ON EXTREME RISK LAWS

As of February 2021, 19 states and the District of Columbia have extreme risk laws and at least eight peer-reviewed studies have examined the impact of these laws.

Implementation and effectiveness of Connecticut's risk-based gun removal law: Does it prevent suicides? *Swanson et al. (2017).^v*

Researchers studied Connecticut's extreme risk law from 1999-2013 and found 762 orders (called "risk-warrants") were issued in that time period, increasing in frequency after the 2007 Virginia Tech shooting. They found that risk-warrants reached people who were at a dangerously elevated risk of suicide and prevented additional suicide deaths by intervening in suicidal crises.

- The typical risk-warrant subject was a middle-aged or older man and suicidality or self-injury was listed as a concern in at least 61% of cases where such information was available.
- Police found firearms in 99% of cases, removing an average of seven guns per subject.
- People in Connecticut subject to orders had an annual suicide rate 40 times higher than the general population, showing the increased risk among this population.
- **For every 10-20 orders issued, at least one suicide was prevented.**

Effects of risk-based firearm seizure laws in Connecticut and Indiana on suicide rates, 1981–2015.

Kivisto & Phalen (2018).^{vi}

Researchers studied the state-level impact of Indiana and Connecticut's extreme risk laws on suicides. They used statistical modeling to estimate what the firearm suicide rate would have been in each state if it did not have an extreme risk law. They then compared the real firearm suicide rates to the rates predicted by the statistical model.

- Indiana's extreme risk law was associated with an estimated 7.5% reduction in firearm suicides.
- Connecticut's extreme risk law was associated with an estimated 13.7% reduction in firearm suicides.
- **The researchers concluded that extreme risk laws were linked to promising reductions in firearm suicides in both Connecticut and Indiana.**

Criminal justice and suicide outcomes with Indiana's risk-based gun seizure law.

Swanson et al. (2019).^{vii}

Researchers studied Indiana's extreme risk law from 2006-2013 and found that 395 firearm removal orders were issued, and 1,079 firearms were temporarily removed. The researchers found that orders were issued for individuals at dangerously high risk for self-harm.

- Suicidal ideation was cited as a reason for issuing the order in nearly 70% of these cases.
- Domestic disturbance was cited in 28% of cases and homicidal ideation was cited in 21%.
- The majority of cases involved White men with suicidal ideation where police removed more than one firearm.
- People in Indiana subject to orders had an annual suicide rate 31 times higher than the general population, showing the increased risk among this population.
- **One suicide was prevented for every 10 firearm removal orders issued.**

Extreme risk protection orders intended to prevent mass shootings: A case series.

Wintemute et al. (2019).^{viii}

Researchers studied California's extreme risk law by examining the court records of 159 orders issued from 2016 to 2018. They concluded that California's extreme risk law has been used as a tool to help prevent numerous mass shootings, and they examined each of these cases in depth.

- In 21 orders, the subject showed clear signs that they intended to commit a mass shooting.
- Orders were used as a tool by law enforcement to help prevent school, workplace, and politically motivated mass shootings.
- No mass shootings, suicides, or homicides associated with order subjects were identified to have occurred after the orders were issued.
- **The authors concluded that extreme risk laws may play a role in efforts to prevent mass shootings.**

Assessment of extreme risk protection order use in California from 2016 to 2019.

Pallin et al. (2020).^{ix}

Researchers studied California's extreme risk law by examining the court records of 1,076 orders from 2016 to 2019.

- Three quarters of all California counties issued at least one order during this time period. However, the vast majority of orders issued occurred in a handful of counties and most were issued in 2019.
- Most respondents were male (91.5%) and White (59.2%).
- Law enforcement officers were petitioners in nearly all cases (96.5%).
- **The authors found the uptake of California's GVRO law was slow but increased considerably in 2018 and again in 2019. The increase in use was driven by a few counties and suggests the importance of local leadership and law enforcement training to increase use of this policy.**

Extreme risk protection orders in Washington: A statewide descriptive study.

Rowhani-Rahbar et al. (2020).^x

Researchers conducted a descriptive study of Washington's extreme risk law to assess reasons for filing the order, characteristics of the respondent, number and type of firearms removed, and ERPO petition outcome.

- There were 238 orders filed in Washington state between December 8, 2016 and May 10, 2019 with similar numbers of orders issued for harm to self (n=67), harm to others (n=86), or both harm to self and others (n=84). One respondent was excluded due to lack of information.
- 30% of respondents were issued a court-ordered mental health evaluation.
- **The authors concluded that most orders in Washington have been filed by law enforcement to prevent self-harm, harm to others, and harm to self and others. Orders can help individuals gain access to mental health care, though it is critical to note that ERPOs are not intended to solely be used as a mental health tool.**

Extreme risk protection orders in King County, Washington: The epidemiology of dangerous behaviors and an intervention response.

Frattaroli et al. (2020).^{xi}

Researchers conducted a descriptive study of the use of ERPOs in King County, Washington.

- In 2017 and 2018, there were 75 ERPO petitions filed, 97% of which were filed by law enforcement.
- Judges granted a temporary order in all 75 cases and 65 (87%) of the cases resulted in a one-year order.
- Of the 75 respondents, 30 (40%) were described as a risk to themselves only, 20 (27%) were described as a risk to others only, and 25 (33%) were described as a risk to themselves and others.
- In five of the cases, the risk to others was classified as a mass shooting threat.
- For 95% of the temporary orders issued, the court issued the order because of current violence or brandishing a firearm.
- **The researchers found that the law was appropriately being applied by law enforcement in situations where someone is threatening violence to self or others, or for cases of brandishing a firearm.**

Extreme risk protection orders and persons with dementia in the state of Washington.

Prater et al.^{xii}

Researchers studied Washington's extreme risk law to assess where and why the law was used for persons with dementia.

- Nine orders filed between December 8, 2016, and May 10, 2019 were for persons with dementia, six of which were granted for one year.
- All of the persons with dementia were men; one was a Black man and eight were White men.
- Two of the petitioners were family members and seven of the petitioners were law enforcement.
- Five of the respondents had contact with law enforcement and/or adult protective services before the order was filed, typically for cases of violent or erratic behavior.
- All but one of the individuals had kept their firearms on them or in a location that was not secure.
- **Risk orders can be used to protect persons living with dementia.**

IN ADDITION TO THE PEER-REVIEWED RESEARCH, THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL PEER-REVIEWED COMMENTARIES OF EXTREME RISK LAW RESEARCH.

The color of risk protection orders: Gun violence, gun laws, and racial justice.

Swanson JW.^{xiii}

- This commentary is a response to “Extreme risk protection orders in King County, Washington: The epidemiology of dangerous behaviors and an intervention response.”
- This response served as a call to ensure that future ERPO research looks into racial disparities as a result of the law.

Extreme risk protection orders in Washington: A tool for reducing the lethality of dangerous behaviors.

Frattaroli et al.^{xiv}

- This commentary is a response to “Extreme risk protection orders in Washington: A statewide descriptive study.”
- This response cautions against including information about a respondent’s treatment for mental illness. The authors also note how conversations about ERPO can be framed in the context of conversations around police reform.

Risk-based temporary firearm removal orders: A new legal tool for clinicians.

Swanson et al.^{xv}

- This commentary outlines how clinicians should be authorized petitioners for extreme risk laws.
- The authors concluded that clinicians should be allowed to petition for an ERPO to help keep their patients safe.

Extreme risk laws save lives. Grounded in evidence and based on risk of violence towards self or others, these laws are helping to prevent gun deaths and protect communities from tragedy.

References:

- ⁱ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Firearm Deaths and Rates per 100,000. WONDER Online Database, 2015-2019. Available: <http://wonder.cdc.gov/ucd-icd10.html>.
- ⁱⁱ Anglemeyer A, Horvath T, & Rutherford G. (2014). The accessibility of firearms and risk for suicide and homicide victimization among household members: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Dahlberg LL, Ikeda RM, & Kresnow MJ. (2004). Guns in the home and risk of a violent death in the home: Findings from a national study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*.
- ^{iv} Consortium for Risk-Based Firearm Policy. (2013). Guns, public health, and mental illness: an evidence-based approach for state policy. Available: <http://efsgv.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Final-State-Report.pdf>.
- ^v Swanson JW, et al. (2017). Implementation and effectiveness of Connecticut's risk-based gun removal law: Does it prevent suicides? *Law and Contemporary Problems*.
- ^{vi} Kivisto AJ & Phalen PL (2018). Effects of risk-based firearm seizure laws in Connecticut and Indiana on suicide rates, 1981–2015. *Psychiatric Services*.
- ^{vii} Swanson JW, et al. (2019). Criminal justice and suicide outcomes with Indiana's risk-based gun seizure law. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*.
- ^{viii} Wintemute GJ, Pear VA, Schleimer JP, Pallin R, Sohl S, Kravitz-Wirtz N, et al. (2019). Extreme Risk Protection Orders Intended to Prevent Mass Shootings: A Case Series. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
- ^{ix} Pallin R, Schleimer JP, Pear VA, & Wintemute GJ. (2020). Assessment of Extreme Risk Protection Order Use in California From 2016 to 2019. *JAMA Network Open*.
- ^x Rowhani-Rahbar A, Bellenger MA, Gibb L, Chesnut H, Lowry-Schiller M, Gause E, ... & Rivara FP. (2020). Extreme Risk Protection Orders in Washington: A Statewide Descriptive Study. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
- ^{xi} Frattaroli S, Omaki E, Molocznik A, Allchin A, Hopkins R, Shanahan S, & Levinson A. (2020). Extreme risk protection orders in King County, Washington: the epidemiology of dangerous behaviors and an intervention response. *Injury Epidemiology*.
- ^{xii} Prater LC, Haviland MJ, Rivara FP, Bellenger MA, Gibb L, & Rowhani-Rahbar A. (2020). Extreme Risk Protection Orders and Persons with Dementia in the State of Washington. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
- ^{xiii} Swanson JW. (2020). The color of risk protection orders: gun violence, gun laws, and racial justice. *Injury Epidemiology*.
- ^{xiv} Frattaroli S, & Irvin NA. (2020). Extreme risk protection orders in Washington: A tool for reducing the lethality of dangerous behaviors. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
- ^{xv} Swanson J, Nestadt P, Barnhorst A, & Frattaroli S. (2021). Risk-Based Temporary Firearm Removal Orders: A New Legal Tool for Clinicians. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*.